

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS

Appellants:	Michael D. Stapf	SECOND REPLY BRIEF
Serial No.	09/291,535	
Filing Date	April 14, 1999	
Group Art Unit	2122	
Examiner	C. Das	
Attorney Docket No.	100.113US01 (formally 500.720US01)	
Title: Interface For An Enterprise Resource Planning Program		

Remarks

In the Examiner's Supplemental Answer of February 8, 2005, the Examiner cited new art to support his official notice position and responded to five arguments found in Applicant's Appeal Brief. The Applicant respectfully refers the Board of appeals to the Applicants Reply Brief of December 23, 2003 and the Applicants Appeal Brief of September 22, 2003 which sets out the Applicant's positions. In regard to the newly cited art reference (the Mazzario reference) in the Examiner's Supplemental Answer, the Applicant provides the following in reply:

The new citation to the Mazzario reference does not render the claims obvious by itself or in combination with other cited references. As indicated by the Examiner, Mazzario states "processor 24 enters the process, at block 400 and checks whether all records 203 have been read from input file 200." The Examiner uses this language to state "processing each record" is inherent. However, this language does not make what has been claimed in claims 1, 13 and 20 inherent. For example, the Mezzario reference does not teach or suggest the below limitation of claim 1:

processing each record in the data file according to the parameters in the parameter file to execute screens of the enterprise resource planning system so as to provide the data from the data file to the enterprise resource planning system. (Emphasis added).

SECOND REPLY BRIEF

Serial No. 09/291,535

Attorney Docket No. 100.113US01


Title: INTERFACE FOR AN ENTERPRISE RESOURCE PLANNING PROGRAM

The Examiner, in making the inherency argument, is ignoring the remaining limitation language, such as the language emphasized above in regard to Claim 1. Accordingly, the Mezzario art reference alone or in combination with other references does not teach or suggest the limitations as set out above with regard to Claim 1 or with regard to Claims 13 and 20.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

5-5-5



Scott V. Lundberg
Reg. No. 41,958

Attorneys for Applicant
Fogg and Associates, LLC
P.O. Box 581339
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1339
T 612 332-4720
F 612 677-3553